

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner and his Supervisor for their courtesy and consideration in discussing this Application in a personal interview at the Patent Office on May 21, 2008. Because the interview was discretionary, Applicants send particular thanks. In the interview, certain aspects of video aspect manipulation were discussed, and an agreement was reached on certain amendments to avoid the teachings of the cited art references. The claims are amended according to this agreement. Applicants express appreciation for the efforts of the Examiner and his Supervisor in moving the case forward.

Amendments

Before this Amendment, claims 1-14 and 20-24 were present for examination. Claims 1, 2, 10, and 24 are amended. Claims 25 and 26 are added, and no claims are canceled. Therefore, claims 1-14 and 20-26 are now present for examination, and claims 1, 10, and 24 are the independent claims. No new matter is added by these amendments, as support for the amendments may be found in the Specification (Original Application, p. 7, ll. 9-11; p. 9, ll. 25-34; ref. num. 1932, FIG. 19A).

Applicants respectfully request examination of the claims, as amended in accordance with the understanding reached in the interview. A Request for Continued Examination is submitted concurrently herewith.

35 U.S.C. §102/103 Rejections, Swart et al.

The Final Office Action rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0025832 to Swart et al. (hereinafter "Swart"). The Final Office Action rejected claims 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over various combinations of Swart in view of the cited art.

Regarding the §102(e) rejections, the Office must show that each limitation from the claims appears in a single piece of prior art. Applicants respectfully submit that neither

Swart, nor any of the other cited references, can be relied upon to teach or suggest the novel limitations of the independent claims.

Specifically, the cited references do not teach or suggest methods for aspect ratio conversion, wherein the video conversion information is specified for each of a stream of images making up a video program, as generally recited in claim 1. Nor can they be relied upon to teach or suggest that the video conversion information dynamically changes across the stream of images.

Applicants respectfully submit that the specified limitations in independent claims 1, 10, and 24 are allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Claims 2-9, 11-14, 20-23, 25, and 26, each depend from these independent claims, and are believed allowable for at least the same reasons as given above because of their dependence from an allowable base claim. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the §102(e) and §103(a) rejections to these claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Drapkin
Reg. No. 55,127

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
MLD/sk
61384270 v1